

Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA)

Ileana Paul
(ed.)



AFLA XXVI
The Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the
Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association

University of Western Ontario
May 24-26, 2019

CROSSED-CONTROL IN MALAY/INDONESIAN AS LONG-DISTANCE PASSIVIZATION

Paul Kroeger, Dallas Intl. Univ. & SIL Intl.
Kristen Frazier, Dallas Intl. Univ.

Table of Contents

Paul, Ileana	<i>Preface</i>	i
Baclawski, Kenneth, Jr.	<i>Optional wh-movement and topicalization in Eastern Cham</i>	1-17
Chang, Henry Y.	<i>Tsou Exclamatives in comparative syntax</i>	18-35
Chen, Tingchun	<i>Raising-to-object in Amis</i>	36-53
Collins, James N. and Peter Schuelke	<i>Roviana fronting and the relationship between syntactic and morphological ergativity</i>	54-70
Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka, Theodore Levin and Coppe van Urk	<i>The typology of nominal licensing in Austronesian voice system languages</i>	71-87
Finer, Daniel and Hasan Basri	<i>Clause truncation in South Sulawesi: Restructuring and nominalization</i>	88-105
Hopperdietzel, Jens	<i>Pseudo noun incorporation and differential object marking: object licensing in Daakaka</i>	106-123
Hsieh, Henrison	<i>On the structure of Tagalog non-DP extraction</i>	124-141
Kroeger, Paul	<i>Marking accessible information in Kimaragang</i>	142-158
Kroeger, Paul and Kristen Frazier	<i>Crossed-control in Malay/Indonesian as long-distance passivization</i>	159-174
Macaulay, Benjamin	<i>The prosodic structure of Pazeh</i>	175-191
Ono, Hajime, Koichi Otaki, Manami Sato, 'Ana Heti Veikune, Peseti Vea, Yuko Otsuka and Masatoshi Koizumi	<i>Relative clause processing in Tongan: an effect of syntactic ergativity on the object preference</i>	192-208
Paillé, Mathieu	<i>V=nya in colloquial Malay</i>	209-226
Tollan, Rebecca	<i>Subjecthood and unmarkedness in Niuean</i>	227-247
Travis, Lisa DeMena and Diane Massam	<i>What moves, why, and how: the contribution of Austronesian</i>	248-264

PREFACE

The 26th Annual Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA 26) was held on May 24-26, 2019 at the University of Western Ontario (Canada). The programme consisted of 24 presentations in addition to four plenary talks by Juliette Blevins, Vera Hohaus, Marian Klammer and Becky Tollan. This volume includes 13 papers from the conference.

As conference organizer, I received generous support from a variety of sources. Financial support came from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Research Western, the Joint Fund (Research Western, SOGS, SGPS), the Theoretical and Applied Linguistics Lab, the Canadian Linguistic Association, the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, the Graduate Program in Linguistics and three departments (French Studies, Modern Languages and Literatures, and Anthropology). The conference would not have been possible without the student volunteers (Sonia Masi, William Tran, Caylen Walker and Kang Xu), plus several others who helped out at the registration desk. Finally, I am grateful to the Department of French Studies for administrative support.

Many thanks to the abstract reviewers, to all those who attended, and to Mitcho Erlewine, who helped develop the current stylesheet.

Ileana Paul
University of Western Ontario

CROSSED-CONTROL IN MALAY/INDONESIAN AS LONG-DISTANCE PASSIVIZATION

Paul Kroeger
Dallas Intl. Univ. & SIL Intl.
paul_kroeger@diu.edu

Kristen Frazier
Dallas Intl. Univ.
kristen_frazier@diu.edu

The “crossed control” construction in Malay/Indonesian has been the topic of much discussion and controversy. We analyze it as a relatively normal instance of long-distance passivization under restructuring, thus endorsing the general approach of Berger (2018). Based on cross-linguistic patterns of restructuring, we go on to argue for two types of restructuring that have not been previously recognized in Malay/Indonesian: (a) restructuring with active voice complements, and (b) Raising verbs as restructuring predicates (CC predicates are always “Equi”, i.e., control, predicates).

1. Introduction

Certain control predicates in Malay/Indonesian give rise to a structural ambiguity when the complement verb appears in a non-active voice, as illustrated in (1).¹ The “normal control” (NC) reading reflects a standard biclausal control structure in which the matrix subject is identified with the subject of the complement clause. The alternative reading, which has been dubbed “funny control” (Gil 2002) or “crossed control” (CC) (Polinsky & Potsdam 2008), identifies the external argument of the matrix verb (V_1) with the non-subject external argument of the complement verb (V_2). This alignment is surprising, especially when V_2 is marked for passive voice, because a passive agent is normally not available for syntactic identification with a matrix argument. A variety of ingenious and complex analyses have been proposed to account for the CC reading.² We propose that it arises through long-distance passivization under restructuring, similar to analogous German and Spanish constructions. A Spanish example is provided in (2a).

- (1) a. Beliau tidak ingin saya Ø-wawancara-i.
3SG.HON NEG want 3SG UV-interview-APPL
NC: ‘He doesn’t want to be interviewed by me.’
CC: ‘I don’t want to interview him.’ [adapted from Sneddon 1996: 271]

¹ In sentence (1a), both readings are equally plausible. In sentences (1b-c), the crossed control (CC) reading is strongly preferred due to pragmatic plausibility, but in certain unusual contexts the normal control (NC) reading would also be possible.

² Polinsky & Potsdam (2008), Nomoto (2008), Sato (2010), Berger (2018), *inter alia*.

- b. Tujuh anggota komplotan berhasil di-ringkus polisi.
seven member gang succeed PASS-catch police
NC: 'Seven members of the gang succeeded in being caught by the police.'
CC: 'Police succeeded in catching seven members of the gang.'
[Sneddon 1996: 271]
- c. picture caption in *Harian Ekspres*, 1-Jan-05:
Pemain Real.Madrid dari Brazil, Robinho (kiri),
player R.M. from Brazil (name) left
cuba di-halang pemain Atletico Garcia.Calvo (kanan) ...
try PASS-obstruct player A. (name) right
NC: 'The Real Madrid player from Brazil, Robinho (left), tries to be
guarded by Atletico player Garcia Calvo (right) ...'
CC: 'Atletico player Garcia Calvo (right) tries to guard the Real Madrid
player from Brazil, Robinho (left) ...'
- (2) a. Las casas fueron acabadas de pintar ayer.
the house-PL were finish to paint yesterday
'The houses were finished to paint yesterday.' [Aissen & Perlmutter 1983]
- b. Los obreros acabaron de pintar las casas ayer.
the worker-PL finish to paint the house-PL yesterday
'The workers finished painting the houses yesterday.'
[Aissen & Perlmutter 1983]

Berger (2018) has proposed a detailed formal analysis based on a very similar intuition. In this paper we compare the facts of Malay/Indonesian with what is known about restructuring and long-distance passivization cross-linguistically, and address the following questions: (a) Is restructuring also possible when the complement verb appears in the active voice? (section 2); (b) Why is voice (normally) marked on V₂, rather than V₁? (section 3); (c) Does Indonesian have restructuring predicates of the Raising type? (section 5).

In section 4 we review some widely cited arguments by Polinsky & Potsdam (2008) against a complex head type of analysis. While these arguments do not address the kind of analysis proposed by Berger (2018), we suggest that additional scrutiny of the issues which Polinsky & Potsdam discuss is needed.

2. Crossed Control as Restructuring

The comparison between Indonesian crossed control and restructuring in German and Spanish raises a number of interesting questions. First, why should CC only be possible when the complement verb appears in a non-active voice? This is not the case for restructuring cross-linguistically. Example (2b), the active voice counterpart of (2a), is structurally ambiguous between biclausal vs. restructuring (monoclausal) patterns. However, there is no semantic ambiguity associated with this

difference in structure. Moreover, the structural ambiguity disappears when the object is expressed as a clitic pronoun as in (3), adapted from Aissen & Perlmutter (1983). In languages like German, where clitic climbing does not occur, other diagnostics for restructuring have been identified, including scrambling across a putative clause boundary.

- (3) a. Los obreros acabaron de pintar *las* ayer.
the worker-PL finish to paint them yesterday
'The workers finished painting them yesterday.' [BICLAUSAL]
- b. Los obreros *las* acabaron de pintar ayer.
the worker-PL them finish to paint yesterday
'The workers finished painting them yesterday.' [RESTRUCTURING]

In discussing pairs of sentences like those in (2a-b), Aissen & Perlmutter (1983) state: "These pairs of sentences have the same type of rough synonymy exhibited by other active-passive pairs," i.e., the active and passive forms of simple transitive clauses. This is not surprising, if restructuring constructions are truly monoclausal. Jeoung (2018) has pointed out that the CC readings for sentences like those in (1) can always be paraphrased using the active voice form of V₂. An example is presented in (4).³

- (4) a. Pencuri itu mahu di-tangkap polis.
thief that want PASS-catch police
NC: 'The thief wants to be arrested by the police.'
CC: 'The police want to arrest the thief.'
- b. Polis mahu menangkap pencuri itu.
police want AV.catch thief that
'The police want to arrest the thief.'

Jeoung's generalization follows from the restructuring analysis, because passivization does not affect the truth-conditional meaning of a monoclausal structure. This analysis also seems to predict that Malay/Indonesian should allow restructuring with active voice complement verbs, as well as non-active voices. In other words, sentences like (4b) should be structurally ambiguous in the same way as (2b). However, since the two structures are semantically equivalent, and Indonesian lacks Spanish-style clitic climbing, detecting active voice restructuring would not be an easy task. Berger (2018), in an appendix to his talk, raises the possibility of active voice restructuring, but says that he remains agnostic as to whether this construction really exists in Indonesian.

Davies (2014) argues for active voice restructuring in Madurese on the basis of long-distance scrambling, specifically the fronting of PP arguments. This

³ Malaysian example from Nomoto (2008).

is impossible out of true subordinate clauses, including Raising complements, but possible with CC predicates, whether V₂ bears active or non-active voice. Preliminary evidence from examples like those in (5) suggests that the same basic pattern holds for Indonesian as well. Example (5a) shows that the passive agent PP can be fronted in a monoclausal CC construction. The presence of the complementizer *supaya* in example (5b) marks it as an unambiguously biclausal control structure. Example (5c) shows that the passive agent PP in a biclausal construction cannot be fronted.

- (5) a. Oleh bidan saya mau di-bawa ke rumah.sakit.
by midwife 1SG want PASS-bring to hospital
'The midwife wanted to bring me to the hospital. (But my mother-in-law forbade it, and said that we should just call the village healer.)'
[journal.ui.ac.id/health/article/viewFile/328/324]
- b. Saya ingin supaya di-bawa ke rumah.sakit oleh bidan.
1SG want COMP PASS-bring to hospital by midwife
'I want to be brought to the hospital by the midwife.'
- c. ??Oleh bidan saya ingin supaya di=bawa ke rumah.sakit.
by midwife 1sg want COMP PASS-bring to hospital
(intended: as in (5b))

The corpus example in (6b) demonstrates that an oblique PP can be fronted out of the active complement of a CC predicate, just as it can within a simple clause (6a). Of course more supporting evidence is needed, but assuming it can be found, such examples seem to confirm the existence of active voice restructuring in Malay/Indonesian.

- (6) a. Kepada Pengadilan tersebut saya memberi kuasa untuk ...
to court mentioned 1SG give power to
'To the aforementioned court I give authority to (receive the aforementioned cash compensation and surrender it to the tithe collection agency).' [https://pa-jakartaselatan.go.id/artikel/260-ketika-suami-melanggar-taklik-talak]
- b. Kepada DST disini saya ingin memberi satu cadangan...
to DST here 1SG want give one suggestion
'To DST (Datastream Technology) here I want to give a suggestion...'
[https://ar-ar.facebook.com/BruneiXS/posts/.../10154905954633192/]

Another question raised by the comparison between crossed control and more familiar patterns of restructuring concerns the inventory of CC predicates. Aissen & Perlmutter (1983: 362) note that the inventory of restructuring predicates in Spanish includes both Raising and "Equi" (i.e., control) predicates, and the same seems to be true in many (most?) other restructuring languages as well. The list of

recognized CC predicates in Malay/Indonesian, however, consists exclusively of control predicates.

Nomoto (2008) provides the (non-exhaustive) list of CC predicates shown in (7). (Several other CC predicates appear in examples cited in this paper, including *nekat* ‘insist’, ex. (8b); *lupa* ‘forget’, ex. (8c); *tolak* ‘refuse’, ex. (9d).) Most of these are obligatory (or “exhaustive”) control predicates, with the notable exception of ‘want’, and most are known to occur as restructuring predicates in other languages (Wurmbrand 2001, Grano 2012).

(7)	<i>berani</i> ‘dare’	<i>berjaya</i> ‘succeed’	<i>berhak</i> ‘have the right to’
	<i>berhasil</i> ‘succeed’	<i>berusaha</i> ‘make effort’	<i>cuba</i> (Mal.)/ <i>coba</i> (Ind.) ‘try’
	<i>enggan</i> ‘reluctant’	<i>gagal</i> ‘fail’	<i>hendak</i> ‘to want’ (Mal.)
	<i>ingin</i> ‘want’	<i>layak</i> ‘qualified to’	<i>mahu ~ mau</i> ‘want’
	<i>malas</i> ‘lazy to’	<i>malu</i> ‘ashamed to’	<i>mampu</i> ‘capable’
	<i>rela</i> ‘willing’	<i>suka</i> ‘like to’	<i>takut</i> ‘afraid to’
	<i>terpaksa</i> ‘forced to’	<i>sempat</i> ‘have time/opportunity to’	

CC predicates must be control (rather than Raising) predicates almost by definition: if V_1 is a Raising predicate, there will be no contrast between the normal control and crossed control readings. This is because with Raising predicates, passivization of the complement verb will not affect the meaning of the sentence (*John seems to irritate the Dean* vs. *The Dean seems to be irritated by John*), but in the case of control predicates there is a change of meaning (*The Dean tried to nominate John* vs. *John tried to be nominated by the Dean*). This contrast is one of the standard diagnostics for distinguishing Raising vs. control predicates.

The crossed control reading of a sentence like (4a) arises from passivizing a restructuring construction. It is synonymous with the active sentence (4b) because passivizing a monoclausal structure does not change the basic meaning of the clause. The normal control reading of a sentence like (4a) arises from passivizing a biclausal control construction. It is not synonymous with the active sentence (4b) because passivizing the complement verb does change the meaning of the sentence, but only with control predicates.

Another standard diagnostic for distinguishing Raising vs. control predicates is the fact that control predicates can, but Raising predicates cannot, impose selectional restrictions on the controller (i.e., the antecedent NP). For the sentences in (8), only the crossed control reading is possible, because the subject NP is inanimate and so incompatible with the selectional restrictions imposed by the matrix predicate on its external argument.⁴

⁴ Sentences (8a–b) are corpus examples cited by Arka (2012).

- (8) a. Politik lokal di Indonesia selalu berusaha di-kendalikan oleh pusat.
politics local in Indonesia always try PASS-control by center
CC: 'The central government always tries to control local politics.'
*NC: 'Local politics always tries to be controlled by the central government.'
- b. Ternyata skuter model Eropa nekat di-jual di.sana oleh Honda.
in.fact scooter model Europe insist PASS-sell there by Honda
CC: 'It turns out that Honda insisted on selling the European model of the scooter there.'
*NC: 'It turns out that the European model of the scooter insisted on being sold there by Honda.'
- c. Makanan yang di-pesan oleh pelanggan lupa di-masak oleh koki.
food REL PASS-order by customer forget PASS-cook by chef
CC: 'The chef forgot to cook the food that was ordered by the customer.'
*NC: 'The food that was ordered by the customer forgot to be cooked by the chef.' [<https://repository.polibatam.ac.id/uploads/215207-20170731080749.pdf>]

An obvious question, then, is whether Malay/Indonesian has restructuring predicates of the Raising type? And if so, how would we recognize them? Without the CC-NC contrast, they would be hard to distinguish from auxiliary verbs. We return to this issue in section 5.

A third question raised by the comparison between crossed control vs. restructuring in other languages has to do with the voice-marking morphology. As example (2a) illustrates, the passive morphology in Spanish long-distance passives appears on V₁, and the same is true for German and most other familiar examples. In the CC construction, however, the voice-marking morphology appears most often on V₂, as seen in (1), (4a), (5a), and (8). We address this issue in the next section.

3. Distribution of Voice Morphology

A number of authors have stated that voice in the CC construction is expressed only on V₂. As pointed out by Arka (2014) and Berger (2018), this is the most common pattern but not the only pattern. Voice can actually be marked on either verb, or on both, provided that the two verbs are not marked for different voice categories. The sentences in (9) illustrate voice marking only on V₁, while the sentences in (10) illustrate voice marking on both verbs.

- (9) a. Setiausaha.Agung yang baru... *di-cuba bunuh* oleh Datuk.Musa...
Secretary-General REL new PASS-try kill by D.M.
'The new Secretary-General... was tried to be killed by Datuk Musa...'
[<http://shalattas.blogspot.com/2012/06/politik-serpihan-1989-gagak-meniru-ayam.html>]

- b. Tapi kita tak tahu apa yang *di-suka* makan...
 but 1PL.INCL NEG know what REL PASS-like eat
 ‘But we don’t know what they like to eat...’
 [abdrahims.blogspot.com/2013/02/kenal.html]
- (10) a. Bung Karno pernah *di-coba* *di-bunuh* enam kali.
 brother K. EXPER PASS-try PASS-kill six times
 ‘Pres. Sukarno was tried to be killed six times.’
 [https://ableh212.wordpress.com/2009/08/17/bung-karno-pernah-dicoba-dibunuh-6-kali/]
- b. Buah itu kemudian *di-coba* *di-makan*, ternyata rasa=nya asam.
 fruit that subsequently PASS-try PASS-eat perceived flavor=3SG sour
 ‘The fruit was then tried to be eaten, and its taste was found to be sour.’
 [http://surabaya.tribunnews.com/2010/09/21/olah-bogem-menjadi-sirup-dodol-dan-selai]
- c. Segala macam daun *di-suka* *di-makan* langsung bahkan
 all type leaf PASS-like PASS-eat direct even
 tanpa di-olah.
 without PASS-process
 ‘All kinds of leaves are liked to be eaten (by them) immediately, even
 without being processed.’ [http://ini-salma.blogspot.com/2018/04/the-sundanese-...]
- d. rancangan peraturan daerah... akhirnya
 bill regulation local finally
di-tolak *untuk di-sahkan* oleh DPRD Gresik.⁵
 PASS-reject to PASS-pass by legislature Gresik
 ‘The DPRD (local legislative assembly) of Gresik finally refused to pass
 the local regulation bill’. (lit: ‘the local regulation bill was refused to be
 passed by the DPRD’) [Arka, 2012]

Importantly, when both verbs are inflected for voice, it is not enough that they select the same argument as subject; the voice categories must be identical. Thus it is not possible for one verb to be marked as passive while the other is inflected for Undergoer Voice (= “bare passive”), as illustrated in the following examples from Arka (2014).

- (11) a. Mobil itu yang coba ku=jual.
 car that REL (UV.)try 1SG=UV.sell
 CC: ‘That car is the one I tried to sell.’

⁵ Some (but not all) control predicates in Indonesian allow the complement clause to be introduced by the optional prepositional complementizer *untuk* (Sneddon 1996: 273, 295). A few CC predicates can optionally retain *untuk* between the two verbs in the CC construction as well, as seen in (10d), though it seems that different speakers have different judgments about where this is acceptable. This situation is somewhat reminiscent of Spanish, where different restructuring predicates may require different linking particles (*de*, *a*, \emptyset) to occur between the two verbs.

- b. Mobil itu yang ku=coba jual.
 car that REL 1SG=UV.try (UV.)sell
 CC: 'That car is the one I tried to sell.'
- c. *Mobil itu yang di-coba ku=jual.
 car that REL PASS-try 1SG=UV.sell
 (intended: 'That car is the one I tried to sell.')

It is important to note that sentences like those in (9a) and (10a-b) cannot be analyzed as involving biclausal control structures. When *cuba/coba* functioning as matrix verb in a Normal Control construction gets passivized, the entire complement clause appears as matrix subject, as illustrated in (12), and not just the complement's patient.

- (12) [Berdagang lewat internet] sudah di-coba oleh Ayah
 trading follow internet already PASS-try by father
 'Doing business on the internet has been tried by Father.' [Arka 2000]

The statistical preference for voice to be marked only on V₂ is largely due to independent morphological factors, which prevent most CC matrix predicates from being inflected for voice. A significant number of these predicates, including the adjectives (*takut* 'afraid', *malas* 'lazy', *rela* 'willing', etc.) and derived intransitives (*berjaya* 'succeed', *berhak* 'entitled to', *berhasil* 'succeed in', *berusaha* 'make an effort to'), never participate in voice alternations. Others, including *mau* 'want', *ingin* 'want', *suka* 'like', and *lupa* 'forget', are "pseudo-transitive" verbs (Stephens 1970; Vamarasi 1999:146 ff; Musgrave 2000). Pseudo-transitives are morphologically defective: they can occur as independent main verbs in Undergoer Voice, as illustrated in (13), but normally cannot take a voice prefix (active or passive) unless they also bear a transitivity suffix, as shown in (14–15). Interestingly, however, at least one pseudo-transitive (namely *suka* 'like') can take passive morphology without any suffix (normally impossible) just when it occurs as the V₁ of a CC construction; see examples (9b) and (10c) above.

- (13) a. Kau tidak perlu men-[t]erima takdir yang tidak kau=Ø-mau!
 2SG NEG need AV-receive fate REL NEG 2SG=UV-want
 'You don't need to accept a fate that you don't want!'
 [<http://bastra14.blogspot.com/2014/02/quotes-naruto-shippuden-full.html>]
- b. Ikhwan⁶ pun akan kau=Ø-lupa.
 Ikhwan also FUT 2SG=UV-forget
 'You will forget Ikhwan too.' Or: 'You will forget even Ikhwan.'
 [*Epilog cinta*, by Sabariah Araur, p. 154. Utusan Publications, 2005; via Google books]

⁶ *Ikhwan*, an Arabic loan meaning 'brother, comrade', is used in this story as proper name.

(14)	ROOT	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
	<i>lupa</i> ‘forget’	<i>melupa*(-kan)</i>	<i>di-lupa*(-kan)</i>
	<i>suka</i> ‘like’	<i>menyuka*(-i)</i>	<i>di-suka*(-i)</i>
	<i>ingin</i> ‘want’	<i>mengingin*(-kan/-i)</i>	<i>di-ingin*(-kan/-i)</i>

(15) a. *Baju itu di-ingin=nya.
 dress that PASS-want=3SG
 (intended: ‘He/she wants that shirt/dress.’ [Vamarasi 1999:147])

b. *Makanan itu di-suka=nya.
 food that PASS-like=3SG
 (intended: ‘He/she likes that food.’) [Vamarasi 1999:147]

Voice marking on both verbs is found in other languages as well. Wurmbrand (2015) has pointed out that restructuring in some Austronesian languages requires a kind of voice harmony, with both verbs bearing the same voice morphology, while in other languages voice is marked on just one of the verbs.⁷ She proposes a formal model of restructuring in which the lower VP is introduced by an unvalued voice head, *v_R*, which must acquire its voice feature from a higher voice head. The result is that the two verbs get identical voice features, but differ in how this feature is morphologically expressed. The voice feature is spelled out on both verbs in Chamorro and Isbukun Bunun, but in Mayrinax Atayal and Takibakha Bunun it is spelled out only on *V₁*, with *V₂* appearing in the default AV form.

Berger (2018) extends this analysis to Malay/Indonesian, with the voice feature spelled out only on *V₂* as the preferred option. But he notes that the language also permits voice to be spelled out on both verbs, or only on *V₁*. Under this analysis, Crossed Control is seen as a kind of “Object-to-Subject Raising”:⁸

On this idea, Crossed ‘Control’ is a misleading term (used in the literature), since there is no control relation between two nominals, one of which is covert; CC here involves Long Object Movement [i.e., long passivization — PK&KF], or Object-to-Subject Raising.

The literal translations offered above, e.g. ‘Pres. Sukarno was tried to be killed six times’ in (10a), are intended to reflect the assumption that both verbs have identical voice features (or share the same voice feature), regardless of where this feature is morphologically expressed.

⁷ Voice harmony in long-distance passives is also reported in Turkish (Kornfilt 1996) and (optionally) in Norwegian (Lødrup 2014). Variation in the locus of voice marking between *V₁* and *V₂* is reported in Japanese (Fukuda 2012) and Uyghur (Sugar 2014 ms.).

⁸ This view is also adopted by Kartini & Nomoto (2017: 142).

4. Arguments against “Clause Union”

Polinsky & Potsdam (2008), focusing on the verbs of wanting (*mau* and *ingin*), offer several arguments against a complex predicate (or “Clause Union”) analysis for the CC construction, under which the two verbs are assumed to form a complex head. Their strongest argument is based on examples which seem to show that in the CC construction, V₁ and V₂ can be independently negated (16) or deleted under ellipsis (17–18), preserving the CC reading.⁹

- (16) Anak-anak mau tidak di-belikan sepeda oleh ibu.
children want NEG PASS-buy bicycle by mother
intended: ‘The mother wants to not buy bicycles for the children.’
- (17) Mobil ini mau di-jual oleh Ali dan sepeda itu mau
car this want PASS-sell by Ali and bicycle that want
di-beli oleh Siti.
PASS-buy by Siti
intended: ‘Ali wants to sell this car, and Siti, to buy that bicycle.’
- (18) Mobil ini mau di-jual oleh Ali dan
car this want PASS-sell by Ali and
sepeda itu mau ~~di-beli oleh Ali~~ juga.
bicycle that want PASS-buy by Ali also
intended: ‘Ali wants to sell his car, and his bicycle also.’

We have been unable to replicate these judgments. Our primary consultant, a woman from northern Sulawesi, found the CC reading impossible for example (16). The only interpretation which she found possible requires interpreting *mau tidak* as an alternative yes-no question under the normal control interpretation: ‘Do the children want mother to buy bicycles for them or not?’ For examples (17–18) she accepted the CC reading for the first clause, but not for the second where one verb was omitted. Her interpretation of (17): ‘Ali wants to sell this car, and Siti bought that bicycle.’ Her interpretation of (18): ‘Ali wants to sell this car, and that bicycle also wants it’ (judged to be pragmatically bizarre, but the only reading available).

We also checked these sentences with seven other speakers via email. Only one of them found the readings reported by Polinsky & Potsdam even marginally acceptable. This difference in judgments could arise from a combination of different factors. Regional and individual variation are well-known issues in Indonesian syntax. Another complicating factor may be the existence of secondary, Aux-like senses for some CC predicates, most notably *mau* ‘want’. As noted by Musgrave (2001: 147), Fortin (2012), Arka (2014), and Jeoung (2018), *mau* can also function (at least in conversational Indonesian) as an auxiliary marking

⁹ Examples from Polinsky & Potsdam (2008: 1622-23).

prospective aspect. It appears that for some speakers (but not all), *ingin* ‘want’ can also function in this way.¹⁰ Jeoung (2018) states that these secondary senses are a significant source of confusion or uncertainty for linguists eliciting judgments about the CC construction, whether the elicitation is done monolingually or in translation.

Polinsky & Potsdam offer another argument based on the distribution of the “emphatic” particle =*lah*.¹¹ They state:

The third argument against Clause Union comes from the distribution of the emphatic (foregrounding) particle *-lah*. This particle, whose semantics is rather subtle, attaches to the first constituent of a complex predicate (Sneddon, 1996: 261–263)... If the CCC involved a complex predicate, *-lah* should only attach to *mau* and not the following main verb. This prediction is not borne out however. *-Lah* can attach to either verb...

The passage which they cite from Sneddon (1996) reads as follows:

Its [= particle *-lah*] most common function is to mark the predicate when the predicate is out of its normal position, usually when it is placed before the subject... Particle *-lah* attaches to the first word of the predicate, which may be a negative, temporal marker, or modal. [Sneddon, 1996: 261–262]¹²

Sneddon never uses the term “complex predicate”, and uses the term “predicate” to refer (in a verbal clause) to the verb plus its auxiliaries and the negation marker:

The predicate is the essential component of every clause (see 3.4). A predicate phrase contains an obligatory predicate centre, which is a verb or one of a number of phrases, including noun phrase, adjective phrase, and prepositional phrase. The predicate centre determines the type of clause, as discussed in section 3.4. In addition to the obligatory centre a predicate phrase may contain a number of other elements, including markers of time, modality, negation and reciprocity. [Sneddon, 1996: 194–195]¹³

¹⁰ Jeoung argues that several other CC predicates also have secondary senses which allow them to be used as auxiliaries, at least for some speakers.

¹¹ Polinsky & Potsdam’s first argument is based on the claim that *mau* and *ingin* cannot occur on their own in the passive or Undergoer Voice, so should not be able to participate in long-distance passivization. As we have shown, *mau* and *ingin* are “pseudo-transitive” verbs which cannot take a voice prefix (active or passive) unless they also bear a transitivizing suffix. However, they can occur in Undergoer Voice in their base form, as illustrated in (13a).

¹² The facts concerning the placement of the particle *-lah* are complex. Most aspectual auxiliaries never host the particle, aside from *sudah* ‘already’ which might be better analyzed as an adverb. So Sneddon is referring here primarily to modals and negation markers.

¹³ The CC example cited by Polinsky & Potsdam to demonstrate variable position of the particle *-lah* involves normal SVO word order; the predicate is not displaced from its normal position in any way. For this reason it not clear whether Sneddon’s generalization makes any predictions about that particular example or not.

Thus Sneddon's statement about the distribution of *-lah* within a displaced predicate phrase is relevant to the analysis of the CC construction only if CC predicates are considered to be a type of auxiliary, or at least to share the relevant syntactic properties of auxiliaries. The degree of similarity between auxiliaries and CC predicates is an interesting question for many reasons, to which we now turn.

5. Distinguishing CC Predicates from Auxiliaries

As mentioned in section 2, restructuring predicates in languages like Spanish and German include Raising as well as control predicates. If restructuring predicates of the Raising variety occur in Indonesian, they would be very hard to distinguish from auxiliaries. More generally, Jeoung (2018) has suggested that many putative CC constructions are actually Aux+V constructions. How might we test this hypothesis?

One of the challenges lies in the fact that Indonesian auxiliaries are not a uniform class. Modals have some different properties from aspectuals (Fortin 2012), and even among the aspectuals, *telah* 'PERF' and *sedang* 'CONT' differ in certain ways from the others. Jeoung (2018) identifies one diagnostic that does seem to work fairly well: auxiliaries always precede the agentive pronoun in the Undergoer Voice construction, as seen in (19a), while the main verb must immediately follow the agentive pronoun.

- (19) Ayah *sudah/telah/akan* *ku*=obati.
Father already/PERF/FUT 1SG=treat(medically)
'I {already/have} treated/will treat Father.' [adapted from Jeoung 2018]
- b. Ayah *coba/mau/suka* *ku*=obati.
Father try/want/like 1SG=treat(medically)
'I will try/tried/want/like to treat Father.' [adapted from Jeoung 2018]

In the CC construction, when UV is marked only on V_2 (as is most often the case), then the CC predicate precedes the agentive pronoun just like an auxiliary, as seen in (19b). But with transitive and pseudo-transitive CC predicates, UV can be marked on V_1 (instead of or in addition to V_2). Some examples are presented in (20); see also (1a) and (11b) above.

- (20) a. makanan *terburuk* yang pernah *saya* *coba* makan
food worst REL PERF 1SG try eat
'the worst food that I have ever tried to eat' (lit: 'that has ever tried to be eaten by me' [<https://www.tripadvisor.co.id> › ...› Inggris › London › Restoran di London])

- b. sekadar bergambar bersama durian yang tidak *ku=suka* makan.
 enough pictured with durian REL NEG 1SG=like eat
 photo caption: ‘barely able to be photographed with durian, which I do not like to eat.’ (lit: ‘which does not like to be eaten by me.’)
 [http://oxygen94.blogspot.com/2012/01/]

A related diagnostic is the fact that auxiliaries can never take the passive prefix, whereas this is possible for some CC predicates as seen in examples (9) and (10). Let us try to apply these diagnostics to the aspectual predicates *mula* ‘begin’ and *habis* ‘finish’, whose translation equivalents function as restructuring predicates of the Raising variety in a number of languages.

Examples (21–22) show that these aspectual predicates can either follow or precede the agentive pronoun in the UV construction, which distinguishes them both from auxiliaries and from normal (non-restructuring) Raising verbs. The examples in (23) show that these aspectual predicates can be inflected for passive voice, when they are followed by a restructured complement verb, which further distinguishes them from auxiliaries.

- (21) a. Ia adalah ragam pemikiran baru yang akan *saya mula* bincangkan.
 3SG COP pattern thought new REL FUT 1SG begin discuss
 ‘It is a new way of thinking, which I will (now) begin to discuss.’
 (lit: ‘... which will (now) be begun to be discussed by me.’)
 [https://irfront.net/.../jamal-al-din-al-afhghani-dan-kebangkitan-para...]
- b. Di rumah ada banyak lagi buku yang belum *saya habis* baca.
 in house COP many more book REL not.yet 1SG finish read
 ‘At home there are many more books which have not yet been finished to be read by me.’ [http://www.shamsuddinkadir.com/v2009/2009/02/diari-sk-bandaraya-...]
- (22) a. nama=nya sudah *mula ku=sebut* berkali-kali di hati
 name=3SG already begin 1SG=say many.times in heart
 ‘His name was already begun to be said by me over and over in my heart.’
 [canaifikir.blogspot.com › 2010/12]
- b. Seluruh air Gunung Penanggungan sudah *habis ku=pakai* mandi.
 all water mountain (name) already finish 1SG=use bathe
 ‘All the water on Mt. Penanggungan has already been finished to be used by me for bathing.’ [Edy Santosa (2004) *Cerita rakyat dari Mojokerto, Jawa Timur*, Google]
- (23) a. Makanan yang harus di-kongsi kerana
 food REL should PASS-share because
 pasti tidak dapat *di-habis* makan seorang.
 certain NEG able PASS-finish eat one.person
 Picture caption, showing two very large pieces of Indian fried bread:
 ‘Food which should be shared, because it certainly can’t be finished to be eaten by one person.’ [www.picluck.net/tag/RotiKLCC]

- b. Surah al-Kahfi boleh *di-mula* baca pada waktu Maghrib Khamis...
chapter the.cave can PASS-begin read at time sunset Thursday
‘The *surah* “The Cave” can be begun to be read at the time of evening
prayer on Thursday.’ [<http://webgramb.com/media/1939078204719780194>]

The acceptability of PP fronting in examples like (24) confirms the monoclausality of the construction.

- (24) Oleh bidan saya mula di-obati.
by midwife 1SG begin PASS-treat(medically)
‘By the midwife I was begun to be treated.’ [AlKat, p.c.]

In all of these respects, *mula* ‘begin’ and *habis* ‘finish’ behave like CC predicates. However, these aspectual predicates do not give rise to a CC reading, because they are Raising rather than control predicates. This can be seen by the fact that passivizing the complement verb does not affect the meaning of the sentence, as illustrated by comparing AV vs. UV complement in (25); see also (21b) above.

- (25) a. Saya belum habis *membaca* buku ini kerana terlalu sibuk.
1SG not.yet finish AV.read book this because too busy
‘I have not finished reading this book yet because I am too busy.’
[<https://www.scribd.com/doc/61409630/Ayat-Aktif-Kepada-Ayat-Pasif>]
- b. Novel ini belum habis saya *Ø-baca* kerana...¹⁴
novel this not.yet finish 1SG UV-read because
‘This novel has not yet been finished to be read by me, because (I was
reading another book at the same time).’
[<http://alumnusiu.blogspot.com/2010/04/3-buku-yang-sedang-saya-baca.html>]

These data provide at least preliminary support for the claim that restructuring predicates of the Raising variety do occur in Indonesian, in addition to the control-type (CC predicates) which have been previously recognized.

6. Conclusion

We have argued that the controversial “crossed control” construction in Malay and Indonesian is best analyzed as an instance of a well-known phenomenon, namely long-distance passivization under restructuring. The apparently exotic nature of the CC construction comes almost entirely from the most common locus of the voice morphology. Contrary to some previous descriptions, the voice morphology is not restricted to V₂, but can occur on either or both verbs. Long-distance passivization with voice harmony is not a novel proposal; it has been reported in a number of other languages, both Austronesian and non-Austronesian. The statistical

¹⁴ *Kerana* is Malaysian, *karena* Indonesian.

preference for marking voice only on V₂ in Malay/Indonesian is due to independent factors.

We go on to investigate other similarities between restructuring in Malay/Indonesian and restructuring in other languages. We offer some preliminary evidence for two restructuring patterns that (to our knowledge) have not previously been reported in Indonesian: restructuring with active voice complement verbs, and restructuring predicates of the Raising type. Clearly more work is needed to confirm these claims, but the investigation of these hypotheses promises to enrich our understanding not only of Indonesian grammar but also of the cross-linguistic typology of restructuring.

References

- Aissen, Judith & David Perlmutter. 1983. Clause reduction in Spanish. *Studies in relational grammar 1*, ed. David Perlmutter, 360–403. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Arka, I. Wayan. 2012. Developing a deep grammar of Indonesian within the ParGram framework: Theoretical and implementational challenges. *Proceedings of the 26th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information, and Computation*, eds. Ruli Manurung & Francis Bond, 19–38. Faculty of Computer Science, Universitas Indonesia.
- Arka, I Wayan. 2014. Double and backward control in Indonesian: An LFG analysis. In *Proceedings of the LFG14 Conference*, eds. Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King, 26–46. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Berger, Mike. 2018. Indonesian crossed control: Expanding the typology of restructuring. Paper presented at WCCFL 36. UCLA.
- Davies, William. 2014. Describing Madurese crossed control. *Argument realisations and related constructions in Austronesian languages, Papers from 12-ICAL, Volume 2*, eds. I Wayan Arka and N.L.K. Indrawati, 369–383. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics.
- Fortin, Catherine. 2012. The syntax of ‘standard’ Indonesian modals. Paper presented at 22nd Annual Conference of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (SEALS 22), Agay, France.
- Fukuda, Shin. 2012. Aspectual verbs as functional heads: evidence from Japanese aspectual verbs. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30:965–1026.
- Gil, David. 2002. The prefixes *di-* and *n-* in Malay/Indonesian dialects. *The history and typology of West Austronesian voice systems*, eds. Faye Wouk & Malcolm Ross, 241–283. Canberra, Australia: Pacific Linguistics.
- Grano, Thomas. 2012. Control and restructuring at the syntax-semantics interface. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago. Published as *Control and restructuring*, Oxford University Press (2015).
- Jeoung, Helen. 2018. Revisiting crossed control in Indonesian. Paper presented at The 22nd International Symposium on Malay and Indonesian Linguistics. UCLA.

- Kartini Abd. Wahab & Hiroki Nomoto. 2017. Konstruksi penaikan dan kawalan dalam bahasa Melayu [Raising and control constructions in Malay]. *Aspek teori sintaksis Bahasa Melayu*, eds. Rogayah Abd. Razak & Radiah Yusoff, 118–144. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1996. NP-Movement and ‘Restructuring’. *Current Issues in Comparative Grammar*, ed. R. Freidin, 120–147. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Lødrup, Helge. 2014. Long passives in Norwegian: Evidence for complex predicates. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 37:367–391.
- Musgrave, Simon. 2000. Emotion predicates and grammatical functions in Indonesian. *Proceedings of AFLA 7: The 7th meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, ed. Marian Klamer, 141–153. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- Musgrave, Simon. 2001. *Non-subject arguments in Indonesian*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Melbourne.
- Nomoto, Hiroki. 2008. A unified analysis of funny control. Paper presented at The 12th International Symposium on Malay and Indonesian Linguistics. Leiden.
- Polinsky, Maria & Eric Potsdam. 2008. The syntax and semantics of wanting in Indonesian. *Lingua* 118:1617–1639.
- Sneddon, James. 1996. *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Stephens, Alan. 1970. Pseudo-transitive verbs in Indonesian. *Indonesia* 9:67–72.
- Sugar, Alexander. 2014. A restructuring analysis of Uyghur bleached V2 constructions. Ms., University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- Vamarasi, Marit Kana. 1999. *Grammatical relations in Bahasa Indonesia*. Pacific Linguistics, Series D, v. 93. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2015. Complex predicate formation via voice incorporation. *Approaches to complex predicates*, eds. Lea Nash & Pollet Samvelian, 248–290. Leiden: Brill.